



1
2
3
4
5 **Stratham Planning Board**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **September 2, 2015**
8 **Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room**
9 10 Bunker Hill Avenue
10 Time: 7:00 PM
11

12
13 Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman
14 Dave Canada, Selectmen's Representative
15 Jameson Paine, Member
16 Tom House, Member
17 Christopher Merrick, Alternate
18 Nancy Ober, Alternate
19

20 Members Absent: Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
21

22 Staff Present: Lincoln Daley, Town Planner
23

24 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call.**

25 The Chairman took roll call and asked Mr. Merrick to be a voting member. Mr. Merrick
26 agreed.

27 **2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

28 a. August 5, 2015.

29 b. August 19, 2015.

30 Mr. Merrick noted one change in the August 19 minutes. Mr. Paine made a motion to
31 approve the meeting minutes for August 5, 2015 and August 19, 2015 with the
32 correction made by Mr. Merrick. Motion seconded by Mr. Merrick. Motion carried
33 unanimously.

34 **2. Public Hearing(s).**

35 a. **Rollins Hill Development, LLC. P.O. Box 432, Stratham, NH for the property**
36 **located at 20 Rollins Farm Drive, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 3 Lot 24, Tax Map 3**
37 **Lot 7, and Town of North Hampton, NH Tax Map 15 Lot 24.** Subdivision
38 Application to construct a 43-lot, over 55 Retirement Planned Community
39 Development.

40 The Chairman informed the Board that Rollins Hill Development had requested a
41 continuance until September 16, 2015. Mr. House made a motion to continue to the
42 16th of September. Motion seconded by Mr. Merrick. Motion carried unanimously.

1 **3. Public Meeting(s).**

- 2 a. **Cabernet Builders, PO Box 291, Stratham, NH 03885 for the property located at**
3 **109 High Street, Map 19 Lot 44.** Preliminary Consultation for a nine (9) lot
4 conventional subdivision design.

5 Mr. House stated that he needed to recues himself as he is an abutter to this project. The
6 Chairman asked Ms. Ober to be a voting member in place of Mr. House. Ms. Ober
7 agreed.

8 Mr. Scott Cole, Beales and Associates, civil engineers for the project introduced himself
9 and Mr. Tim Mason, Cabernet Builders, and developer for the application. Mr. Cole said
10 the existing parcel is approximately 20.4 acres in size and in both the
11 Residential/Agricultural (R/A) and Manufactured Home (MAH) districts. The existing
12 parcel consists of one existing home located at the intersections Willowbrook Avenue
13 and High Street. There is a 100' power line easement with one set of overhead utilities
14 bisecting the property

15 The proposal is to leave one existing two acre lot for the existing home subdivide the
16 property into eight additional lots. There will be a 700' cul-de-sac road with a ball
17 configuration at the end of it. Each proposed lot will be over two acres and each have
18 private septic areas and wells. Mr. Cole said he had done some rough scaling to give an
19 idea of the dimensions of distance between the existing home and proposed to help out
20 the abutters. Mr. Cole shared those distances. He said they had done test pits on site and
21 looked at preliminary drainage features and the only permitting requirement will be for
22 a State Subdivision permit. A letter has been submitted and reviewed by the Roadway
23 agent. They are hoping to request a waiver for the roadway width to be reduced from
24 24' to 22'. They anticipate filing the formal application in time for the October 7, 2015
25 meeting. Mr. Cole said they would be happy to hold a site walk..

26 Mr. Merrick said that lot 7 is 1.53 acres. Mr. Cole responded that it falls into the MAH
27 zone where the acre requirement is only one acre.

28 Ms. Ober asked if there was any consideration given to locate the road off of High Street
29 rather than Willowbrook Avenue. Mr. Cole responded that they did look at it, but based
30 on costs and engineering, this seemed to be the less problematic option. Mr. Mason said
31 they are trying to preserve the existing frontage on High Street by keeping the old farm
32 house, tree line, and stone walls. Mr. Mason further stated the Roadway Agent isn't in
33 favor because the Town just paid to re pave that whole roadway.

34 Mr. Paine asked if the applicant felt there was enough room on Lot 7 to accommodate
35 both the septic and well once the house is put in and if they had any concerns dealing
36 with the power lines. Mr. Cole said they had no concerns about either issues and said the
37 power line easement is a no build area which is why the building setbacks have been
38 shown to stop there. Mr. Cole said he had shared the preliminary plan with the power
39 company and were amenable because it doesn't involve any relocation or encroachment
40 on their right of way. Mr. Paine said with Lot 7 being in the MAH zone, did they envision
41 the property would be a manufactured house. Mr. Mason said he would like to reserve
42 the right to build whatever the market favors at the time of construction. Mr. Paine then

1 asked about the view from Lot 8. Mr. Mason said it is their intention to locate the house
2 further back on the lot and to have a buffer.

3 Mr. Daley stated that the location of the entryway into the subdivision itself is right across
4 from the existing home and he asked if there was any opportunity for visual mitigation.
5 Mr. Mason said he is hoping to meet with the people who own that home to discuss what
6 they would like to see.

7 Mr. Merrick referred to Lots 4 and 5 and asked where the condo buildings were that abut
8 those lots. Mr. Mason showed they were quite far away. Mr. Merrick wondered about
9 the driveway for Lot 4 and where it would be located. Mr. Mason said it would come off
10 of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Merrick asked where the house would actually be located. Mr.
11 Mason said they would locate the leach field at the front and put the house at the back.
12 Mr. Merrick asked about drainage. Mr. Cole said that there would be regular road side
13 swales going down around the loop and as a preliminary they are going to have a drain
14 man hole that will actually take it sub surface to a small detention pond in the very rear
15 of the project.

16 Ms. Ober asked if this would be a Town or private road. Mr. Cole replied they are
17 proposing for it to be a Town road.

18 Mr. Paine returned the topic to drainage and asked if they intended to bring in some kind
19 of maintenance easement for that. Mr. Cole said that they would. Mr. Houghton asked
20 what their maintenance plan for the center of the loop in the road was. Mr. Cole said
21 right now the majority of the center would be existing grade mostly because that is what
22 the utility company prefers. Mr. Mason added that they would probably just leave it as
23 a natural area.

24 Mr. Merrick asked about the height on the wires and if it impacted passing traffic on that
25 road. Mr. Cole said he had already started the paperwork with the utility company for a
26 joint use agreement. They do a profile of what the road will be with the utility lines. The
27 utility company gives it to their engineer to see how much the wires will actually sag,
28 and at the worse possible point there is a certain distance that criteria has to meet.

29 Mr. Paine asked about wetlands and buffers. Mr. Cole said they were outside any
30 wetlands.

31 Mr. Houghton asked if they intend to preserve stone walls. Mr. Mason said apart from
32 where they create the entrance way, they are intending to preserve them.

33 Mr. Daley asked if there were any conflicts concerning overlapping well radii or septic
34 systems. Mr. Cole said there are no homes close enough to each other to cause a conflict.
35 He said that they had a call from Jen Mates, the head of the Burnhaven Homeowners'
36 Association who informed them that the septic areas for that development are behind
37 Lots 3 and 4. Said systems are located well away from and will have no impact upon
38 systems in the Burnhaven Subdivision. Mr. Daley then referred to Lots 2, 4 and 5 and
39 asked how they planned to handle the storm water from the roofs of those homes. Mr.
40 Cole responded that they haven't completed a full drainage analysis yet. Typically they
41 try to split the house in two so the majority goes out to the driveway and into the drainage
42 system there. Mr. Daley said if the intent is to make this a public road, is the intent to
43 have the Town maintain the drainage easement in the pond. Mr. Cole said that was their

1 intent. Mr. Daley recommended that as part of their formal application, they think about
2 the easement documentation associated with the drainage system and pond.

3 Mr. Paine referred to the intersection of Willowbrook and the planned subdivision and
4 asked if they would put in any lighting there for night time traffic. Mr. Cole said not at
5 the moment as it's the same as other roads in that area.

6 Ms. Ober asked where the road will be in relation to where the existing house is now and
7 the driveway that goes behind the existing house off of Willowbrook Avenue. Mr. Mason
8 showed Ms. Ober the location of the driveway and the road on the plan. Mr. Cole referred
9 to a small triangular piece of land on the plan and said they could either deed it to the
10 abutter or make it a variable right of way.

11 Ms. Mayer, abutter said she hoped the road would come in off of High Street and she
12 feels like the Wilsons will be most impacted as the road will come in right next to them.

13 A resident asked for a clarification on what it means when a test pit passes. Mr. Cole and
14 Mr. Mason explained the purpose of and summarized the process for conducting test pits.
15 The resident said he has a concern about drainage because he has observed that his own
16 property can look like a swamp at times. He inquired what needs to be approved by the
17 state apart from the D.E.S. Mr. Cole said for this application there shouldn't be any
18 permits required aside from the State Subdivision one. Mr. Daley pointed out that the
19 Town has its own review and in some cases it is more stringent; the applicant must adhere
20 to it as part of the review process.

21 The resident said he would be concerned about headlights if he was the Wilsons. He
22 doesn't like the road wrapping around his whole property, but he realizes he can't do
23 much about that. He asked if it was possible to require the applicant to move the roadway
24 as he can't see how it won't impact the stone wall if the roadway is built where it is
25 suggested. Mr. Mason responded by saying they took a lot of things into consideration;
26 they spoke with the Roadway Agent, and they made sure not to build a house behind Mr.
27 Wilson's house because of the proximity of his house to this property. He doesn't believe
28 that they are impacting anything apart from at the entrance way.

29 Mr. Daley said the Planning Board can evaluate alternative locations of entrance ways as
30 part of the subdivision reviews and also look at the features of the property and make an
31 evaluation going forward.

32 Ms. Mayer repeated she would like the applicant to look at the entrance coming off of
33 High Street instead of Willowbrook Avenue.

34 Ms. Elizabeth Brockelbank, an abutter, said if they moved the road she would be the one
35 affected by head lights. Her concern is that they are downhill from the development and
36 she is looking at eight more wells which will have an increased impact on the water usage
37 in that area, and have an impact on her well. She asked if they analyze the amount of
38 groundwater available, if it will be enough to sustain the water usage in that area, and
39 what the impact will be on the surrounding properties for the size of the homes, which
40 are mostly 4 bedrooms. Mr. Cole replied that that is part of what the State Subdivision
41 permit looks at. He said typically there is enough water on a two acre lot to sustain the
42 usage on that lot. She asked if that information would be available. Mr. Cole said it
43 would be because it is public record.

1 Ms. Brockelbank asked about how much clearance would be necessary. Mr. Cole said
2 he couldn't answer accurately until they have a definitive plan in place, but he does know
3 it wouldn't require an A.O.T. permit. She added she is concerned about the wildlife in
4 the area.

5 Mr. Merrick asked if the final plans will show which trees will remain. Mr. Cole said
6 they didn't see that as being a requirement. Mr. Paine asked if the developer would be
7 amenable to rebuilding elsewhere anything that does get impacted, such as part of the
8 stone wall. Mr. Mason said it is their intention to use the stones they disturb from the
9 wall to help create the entrance going into the subdivision.

10 Mr. Wilson, an abutter, asked what the distance was from the property line to the roadway
11 where the little corner is on the plan and is there any minimum setback requirement. Mr.
12 Cole said that roughly 10', but he would have to confirm that. Mr. Wilson asked if they
13 were planning on tearing down the existing house or leaving it and the house require a
14 new well and septic system. Mr. Cole responded that the well radii shown on the existing
15 plan actually shows the radius around the existing well. They have shown a 4000 S.F.
16 area as it's required by the State whenever you change the size of a lot in a subdivision
17 such as this. Mr. Mason said it is their intention to keep the house and water tower there.

18 Mr. Mason talked about the roadway and said he thinks it's important that people
19 understand there needs to be some sight distance between the corner of the intersection
20 of Willowbrook Avenue and High Street. Relocating the proposed subdivision roadway
21 would be challenging and won't get the blessing of the Road Agent. Mr. Brockelbank
22 said they have a blind driveway so if the entrance to the subdivision was moved to High
23 Street, it would probably not fit the required sight lines.

24 Mr. Mason asked the Board for their opinion on a 22' width for the roadway instead of
25 24'. He said he wasn't going to ask for any waivers until the Road Agent made the
26 request to make the road 22' wide. Mr. Paine asked if Mr. Mason had talked with the
27 Fire Chief. Mr. Mason said he had and the Fire Chief said there is no action needed as
28 the subdivision is under 10 units, but he hasn't discussed a 22' width yet. Mr. Houghton
29 said with reference to the road width, it has been done before. Presuming all the other
30 factors fall into place, it would certainly be something they would consider.

31 Mr. Cole asked if they were permitted to send data to the Town's review engineer prior
32 to the application being accepted. Mr. Daley said they could, but it would be at their own
33 risk and expense.

34 Ms. Mayer referred to Mr. Paine's earlier comment about lighting. She said she would
35 like it to be considered, but wouldn't want it to impede on her neighbors. Mr. Houghton
36 said that street lighting would fall under the Board of Selectmen's purview.

37 Mr. Daley asked if the Board would like to schedule a site walk and clarify dates for a
38 formal submittal. Mr. Cole said they would like to submit the formal application by
39 September 17, 2015. Mr. Houghton felt they should move toward setting up a site walk.
40 Mr. Daley said that typically that doesn't happen until the formal application has been
41 submitted and accepted by the Planning Board so it probably won't happen until after the
42 first meeting in October.

43 **4. Miscellaneous.**

1 There were no miscellaneous items to report.

2 **5. Adjournment.**

3 Mr. Merrick made a motion to adjourn at 7:52 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion
4 carried unanimously.

5